

Date: Tue, 11 Oct 94 04:30:08 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #485  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 11 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 485

Today's Topics:

ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE (2 msgs)  
    Cordless Phone listening to be illegal  
    CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It) (6 msgs)  
        Death of ham radio  
        how do you study for code?  
    Rich McAllister, Digital Scourge of the Airwaves

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 10 Oct 1994 13:36:45 GMT  
From: suggs@tcville.es.hac.com (Brian Suggs)  
Subject: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

I hate surveys that combine two questions into one, but only allow for  
one answer:

>16. The International Morse Code is obsolete and should be eliminated  
> as a requirement for amateur radio licensing.

Obsolete? No.  
Should be eliminated as a requirement? Yes.

-Brian  
KE6KQY/AE

-----

Date: 10 Oct 1994 20:22:54 GMT  
From: wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner)  
Subject: ARRL ROANOKE DIV. ELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

In article <37bg1d\$j8d@hacgate2.hac.com> suggs@tcville.es.hac.com writes:  
>I hate surveys that combine two questions into one, but only allow for  
>one answer:

>  
>>16. The International Morse Code is obsolete and should be eliminated  
>> as a requirement for amateur radio licensing.

>  
It would at least be better if the question was whether the  
\*requirement\* is obsolete. There is more of a correlation between the  
two, then.

-----  
Date: 10 Oct 1994 04:19:34 GMT  
From: billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake)  
Subject: Cordless Phone listening to be illegal

The following was posted in the rec.radio.scanner newsgroup.  
Something to keep in mind is that we now have radios/scanners/etc.  
which have the entire CELLULAR frequencies chopped out to  
eliminate listening to cellular. The concern can certainly  
be voiced that legislation may follow this to have cordless  
less frequencies also banned from future radio receivers.  
Such a move would impact, for example, future full coverage  
ham equipment such as (but obviously not limited to) the  
Kenwood TS-690 (full receive from 500KHz to 60MHz).

Just a point of information at this time, but let's stay tuned  
to what may be the next frequency segment(s) baned from  
future equipment.

--  
Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.net)  
Budd Lake, New Jersey

-----rec.radio.scanner post follows:

From jupiter.planet.net!news.sprintlink.net!sashimi.wwwa.com!not-for-mail Mon Oct  
10 00:03:47 1994  
Path: jupiter.planet.net!news.sprintlink.net!sashimi.wwwa.com!not-for-mail  
From: fd@wwa.com (Glen L. Roberts)  
Newsgroups: rec.radio.scanner,alt.radio.scanner  
Subject: Cordless Snooping Outlawed?  
Date: 9 Oct 1994 11:36:53 -0500  
Organization: WorldWide Access - Chicago Area Internet Services 312-282-8605

708-367-1871

Lines: 28

Message-ID: <379675\$2q4@sashimi.wwa.com>

NNTP-Posting-Host: sashimi.wwa.com

X-Newsreader: TIN [version 1.2 PL2]

Xref: jupiter.planet.net rec.radio.scanner:10005 alt.radio.scanner:13344

So, the Digital Wiretap Act outlawed the monitoring of Cordless Phone Calls? Same as Cellular Now? Or, what?

#### SEC. 202. CORDLESS TELEPHONES.

(a) Definitions.--Section 2510 of title 18, United States Code, is amended--

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ", but such term does not include" and all that follows through "base unit"; and

(2) in paragraph (12), by striking subparagraph (A) and redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

(b) Penalty.--Section 2511 of title 18, United States Code, is amended--

(1) in subsection (4)(b)(i) by inserting "a cordless telephone communication that is transmitted between the cordless telephone handset and the base unit," after "cellular telephone communication,"; and

(2) in subsection (4)(b)(ii) by inserting "a cordless telephone communication that is transmitted between the cordless telephone handset and the base unit," after "cellular telephone communication,".

--

-----  
Glen L. Roberts, Editor, Full Disclosure

Host Full Disclosure Live (WWCR 5,065 khz - Sundays 7pm central)

email fd@sashimi.wwa.com for catalog on privacy & surveillance.

KEVIN MITNICK DISGUISE KIT: From your fax: (708) 356-9646 doc #903

email for uuencoded .TIF of T-Shirt Honoring the FBI

-----  
Date: Mon, 10 Oct 1994 04:19:00 GMT

From: jjmartin@world.std.com (James J Martin)

Subject: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:

: michael silva <mjsilva@ix.netcom.com> writes:

:

: >Please be more careful throwing around this word with regard to

: voluntary activities. When the men with guns come by and "request"

: that you get a ham license, then we can talk about coercion.

:  
: This "voluntary activity" involves obtaining a license from the  
: GOVERNMENT to regain a privilege that that government has, by law,  
: taken away. When the only choices are "do as Uncle Sam says or find  
: another hobby" it isn't truly : voluntary.

You're right, except was it a privilege before it was taken away or after?

But you're free to take up knitting if you like. <tee hee>

Jim

-----  
Date: 9 Oct 1994 22:49:21 GMT  
From: mjsilva@ix.netcom.com (michael silva)  
Subject: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

In <x69U5y4.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>  
>michael silva <mjsilva@ix.netcom.com> writes:  
>  
>>Please be more careful throwing around this word with regard to voluntary  
>>activities. When the men with guns come by and "request" that you get a ham  
>>license, then we can talk about coercion.

>  
>This "voluntary activity" involves obtaining a license from the GOVERNMENT to  
>regain a privilege that that government has, by law, taken away. When the  
>only choices are "do as Uncle Sam says or find another hobby" it isn't truly  
>voluntary.

>  
Nothing is achieved by distorting the meaning of a word beyond all normal useage.  
Nobody \*needs\* a ham license. If you think all licensing and other standards  
are "coercion" than you must spend a lot of time feeling coerced. I notice  
nobody complains of being coerced into passing element 2, which, unlike CW  
\*is\* required of all (U.S.) hams.

Mike, KK6GM

-----  
Date: Sun, 9 Oct 1994 20:01:56 GMT  
From: jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)  
Subject: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>michael silva <mjsilva@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>Please be more careful throwing around this word with regard to voluntary  
>>activities. When the men with guns come by and "request" that you get a ham  
>>license, then we can talk about coercion.

>This "voluntary activity" involves obtaining a license from the GOVERNMENT to  
>regain a privilege that that government has, by law, taken away. When the  
>only choices are "do as Uncle Sam says or find another hobby" it isn't truly  
>voluntary.

In your lifetime, Ed, its been voluntary; the only ones who  
might have any right to complain are those hams of the 20's  
who lost the privilege to operate without a license. But even  
they might have realized the necessity of regulating their  
activity due to other services discovering the usefulness  
of radio.

There was a time when one did not need a license to fly an aircraft  
nor drive a car nor hunt nor fish nor build a house; but as a popu-  
lation grouws certain activities that might endanger the well being  
of the public need to be regulated. Accept this or you'll suffer  
from high blood pressure and constipation.

73 from the Central Pacific,  
Jeff NH6IL  
(Angus: jherman@hawaii.edu)

-----  
Date: Mon, 10 Oct 94 12:56:40 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>  
Subject: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

michael silva <mjsilva@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Nobody \*needs\* a ham license. If you think all licensing and other standards  
>are "coercion" than you must spend a lot of time feeling coerced. I notice  
>nobody complains of being coerced into passing element 2, which, unlike CW  
>\*is\* required of all (U.S.) hams.

A person who wants to use amateur radio DOES need a license.

As for "nobody complains (about) element 2, which...\*is\* required of all  
U.S. hams," maybe it's because element 2 is relevant and the Morse elements no  
longer are?

-----

Date: 10 Oct 1994 20:06:20 GMT  
From: jrbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ)  
Subject: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

>> Jim, W5GYJ, wrote:  
>>  
>> OBLIGATORY REC.RADIO.AMATEUR.POLICY DECLARATION  
>>  
>>namely, that forcing everyone to take this route to an amateur  
>>radio operator's license is coercion.

In article <374o05\$iqdt@ixnews1.ix.netcom.com>,  
Mike Silva, KK6GM <mjsilva@ix.netcom.com> responded:

>Please be more careful throwing around this word with  
>regard to voluntary activities. When the men with  
>guns come by and "request" that you get a ham  
>license, then we can talk about coercion.

Heh, heh. Fire up your kilowatt in the middle of 40 meters,  
right next to WESCARS, yack with your cronies all day and  
don't give any callsigns. The guys with the guns WILL be by  
to see you about that license.

Jim, W5GYJ

-----

Date: 10 Oct 1994 21:59:24 GMT  
From: jrbromley@cha002.ch.intel.com (James Bromley~)  
Subject: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

>>> Mike Silva, KK6GM <mjsilva@ix.netcom.com> wrote:  
>>>  
>>> Please be more careful throwing around this word with  
>>> regard to voluntary activities. When the men with guns  
>>> come by and "request" that you get a ham license, then we  
>>> can talk about coercion.

>> Then, in <x69U5y4.edellers@delphi.com>  
>> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:  
>>  
>> This "voluntary activity" involves obtaining a license  
>> from the GOVERNMENT to regain a privilege that that  
>> government has, by law, taken away. When the only  
>> choices are "do as Uncle Sam says or find another hobby"  
>> it isn't truly voluntary.

> Finally, in article <379s1h\$23m@ixnews1.ix.netcom.com>,  
> Mike Silva, KK6GM <mjsilva@ix.netcom.com> replied:  
>  
> Nothing is achieved by distorting the meaning of a word  
> beyond all normal useage. Nobody \*needs\* a ham license.  
> If you think all licensing and other standards are  
> "coercion" than you must spend a lot of time feeling  
> coerced. I notice nobody complains of being coerced into  
> passing element 2, which, unlike CW \*is\* required of all  
> (U.S.) hams.

So I, W5GYJ, say:

Just for the record, I feel coerced into passing elements  
1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C, 4A, and whatever else the  
FCC can dream up.

I feel coerced into filing a Form 1040 every April.

I feel coerced into halting my vehicle in front of  
these red, octagonal signs that say "STOP".

In short, I am almost constantly coerced by the police power  
of the State, the threat to use force to uphold the  
provisions of its laws. That I agree with, and assent to,  
those provisions is nice, but completely unnecessary to the  
functioning of the State. The iron fist remains in the  
velvet glove.

My point is: when all of these wonderful ideas about valuing  
amateur radio, developing skills within it and cooperating  
with our fellow operators are cast into the Law of the Land,  
all notions of free, voluntary observance are negated and it  
becomes a matter of compulsion. There is a huge qualitative  
difference between the customs and mores of the populace and  
the Law. It is unfortunate that this difference is not well  
appreciated in the U.S.

Jim Bromley, W5GYJ <jbromley@sedona.intel.com>

-----

Date: 10 Oct 1994 23:18:11 GMT  
From: fschwaj@iia.org (Jeffrey fSchwartz)  
Subject: Death of ham radio

I recently heard that a ham in southern NJ was forced to sell his house (at a loss) and move because his radio (which was deemed clean by the FCC) was generating noise on someone's doorbell. The neighbor sued for a large sum citing an invasion of privacy. The neighbor refused to do anything as simple as to allow a filter to be installed or a new doorbell to be installed. Does anyone know anything about this case. I also heard about a group trying to limit amateur radio citing health effects caused by EMF. Most of what I have heard has been third hand, but none of this bodes well. If true, these are VERY BAD precedents to be setting. Is it time to take some action?

Thanks  
-Jeff KA2QOU

--

Jeffrey A. Schwartz  
fschwaj@iia.org

-----  
Date: 10 Oct 1994 21:08:55 GMT  
From: andy@jax.jaxnet.com (J. Andrew Dickerson)  
Subject: how do you study for code?

Mike Lyon (mlyon@rahul.net) wrote:  
: well the title says it all. please post or e-mail.

:                   thank you,  
:                   mlyon@rahul.net  
: --  
: Mike Lyon <mlyon@rahul.net>

I've found the Gordon West tapes from Radio Shack to be excellent. I'm General Class now, so he got me up to 13 wpm very easily. I must admit that I don't use CW very frequently, but those particular tapes are very helpful.

Andy

-----  
Date: 10 Oct 1994 18:22:00 GMT  
From: rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister)  
Subject: Rich McAllister, Digital Scourge of the Airwaves

In article <CxDqvt.3MG@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)



writes:

>>Tell you what, Jeff. You tell me how often you think I should listen and I'll  
>>tell you if I have ever called CQ on a digital mode longer than that  
>>between listening.

>

>After a digital-only subband is created (excluding CW) then you can  
>remove the speaker from your receive if you like; but until then good  
>operating practice dictates that you monitor the frequency you're  
>using.

>

Tell you what, Jeff. You tell me how often you think I should listen and I'll  
tell you if I have ever called CQ on a digital mode longer than that  
between listening.

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

-----

Date: 10 Oct 1994 15:02:35 -0500

From: mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)

References<x69U5y4.edellers@delphi.com> <CxF8z8.Kxy@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<pu81hrM.edellers@delphi.com>

Subject: Re: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

In article <pu81hrM.edellers@delphi.com>,

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> wrote:

>Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> writes:

>

>>In your lifetime, Ed, its been voluntary; the only ones who  
>>might have any right to complain are those hams of the 20's  
>>who lost the privilege to operate without a license. But even  
>>they might have realized the necessity of regulating their  
>>activity due to other services discovering the usefulness  
>>of radio.

>

>Necessity of regulation, yes. Necessity of ARBITRARY regulation, no way.

>

>And the fact is that EVERY American has the legal, and moral, right to  
>complain about Federal policies they disagree with. It's part of the reason we  
>have a First Amendment.

Can you say "whine?" Sure you can!

--

"I'm not a real doctor, but I play one on television."

-----

Date: Mon, 10 Oct 94 12:59:44 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<CxDqF6.3F8@news.Hawaii.Edu> <xa1VRQz.edellers@delphi.com>,  
<37a9hs\$dag@circnis1.unl.edu>  
Subject: Re: Get Over It

gregory brown <gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu> writes:

>You don't HAVE to know RTTY shift (if you don't use RTTY), or what  
>freq is black for ATV (if you don't use ATV), or what an AND gate is  
>(if you don't plan to build a circuit), or "drum speed" if you aren't  
>interested in facsimile to use the spectrum wisely either. Why not  
>just forget the whole idea of testing?? (that's a rhetorical question  
>in case anyone missed the tone)

Maybe we SHOULD drop the questions on which frequency represents black in ATV  
operation, and stick to that which is truly common across all modes and bands?

-----

Date: 10 Oct 1994 19:40:04 GMT  
From: jrbromley@sedona.intel.com (Jim Bromley, W5GYJ)

References<19940ct06.004446.175602@zeus.aix.calpoly.edu>  
<371emo\$se3@chnews.intel.com>, <CxAGw6.BIE@news.hawaii.edu>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content

In article <CxAGw6.BIE@news.hawaii.edu>,  
Jeff Herman, NH6IL <jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu> wrote:

{some deleted}

>Really Jim, why would you expect more from HF CW than from  
>2M? As a matter of fact (AAMOF?), I do hear more technical  
>matters being discussed on HF CW than I copy on 2M. This  
>might be due to my QTH being in the Central Pacific - foreign  
>hams seem to love technical QSO's.

Simple - time and effort to qualify for access:

2m - 2 to 4 weeks study of theory and regs.

CW - 30 years of code practice to reach 13 wpm.  
(Anything less than 13 wpm doesn't seem to  
qualify as "CW" in these parts)

Of course these are my own findings. Your Mileage May Vary. ;-)

>73 from the hurricane and tsunami magnet of the Pacific,

73 from the dust magnet behind my filing cabinet.

Jim Bromley, W5GYJ <jbromley@sedona.intel.com>

-----

Date: Mon, 10 Oct 94 12:54:44 -0500  
From: Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com>

References<374o05\$iqT@ixnews1.ix.netcom.com> <x69U5y4.edellers@delphi.com>,  
<CxF8z8.Kxy@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject: Re: CW QSO Content (Re: Get Over It)

Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> writes:

>In your lifetime, Ed, its been voluntary; the only ones who  
>might have any right to complain are those hams of the 20's  
>who lost the privilege to operate without a license. But even  
>they might have realized the necessity of regulating their  
>activity due to other services discovering the usefulness  
>of radio.

Necessity of regulation, yes. Necessity of ARBITRARY regulation, no way.

And the fact is that EVERY American has the legal, and moral, right to  
complain about Federal policies they disagree with. It's part of the reason we  
have a First Amendment.

-----

Date: 10 Oct 1994 02:39:56 GMT  
From: gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)

References<Cwynvq.Ezx@cruzio.com> <CxDqF6.3F8@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<xa1VRQz.edellers@delphi.com>  
Subject: Re: Get Over It

Ed Ellers (edellers@delphi.com) wrote:  
: Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> writes:  
:

: >15 minutes per day isn't really too much to study to gain HF privileges.  
:  
: It is when we know that the \*only\* reason it's necessary is because of a Federal  
: rule, NOT because such knowledge is actually needed to use the spectrum wisely.

You don't HAVE to know RTTY shift (if you don't use RTTY), or what  
freq is black for ATV (if you don't use ATV), or what an AND gate is  
(if you don't plan to build a circuit), or "drum speed" if you aren't  
interested in facsimile to use the spectrum wisely either. Why not  
just forget the whole idea of testing?? (that's a rhetorical question  
in case anyone missed the tone)

CW is the second most used mode on HF. It is understood and used by  
certainly more than half the ham population of the world. HF is  
largely a world-wide communications forum. Part of the price you pay  
for the privilege of access to HF is learning this mode.

It is unfortunate that some people do have a difficult time learning  
code, and perhaps there should be some accomodation made for them.  
But some people have a hard time with math and memorizing formulas,  
some with memorizing frequencies, some with understanding at all  
electronics principles. Should we drop these requirements too?

The Tech license does not require code, and there is a tremendous  
amount you can do with it. I'm sure there are very few Techs who have  
tried even a quarter of what is possible for them. Ham radio is  
finally open to those who can not or do not wish to learn code. Enjoy  
it. Contrary to what anyone may say, the Tech is a real and  
honorable license.

I have an Advanced class license. I can operate CW comfortably at 35  
WPM. I also enjoy DX. The only reason I am working toward Extra is  
to get access to the bottom 25 KHz of the HF bands. Maybe I should  
complain about the additional theory on the Extra test...after all, I  
don't intend to do anything different than I do now...the additional  
theory isn't necessary for me to use the spectrum wisely. It isn't  
fair or logical, is it? Sure, maybe I'll join all the complainers  
about these darn tests!.....Don't hold your breath.

Greg WB0RTK

-----

Date: Sun, 9 Oct 1994 23:10:40  
From: lenwink@indirect.com (Len Winkler)

References<kevin.jessup.11.00109888@mail.mei.com> <376n36\$f1u@chnews.intel.com>,  
<376u08\$57c@abyss.West.Sun.COM>

Subject: Re: Code debate solved on national show?

>>>>On Sunday, October 23, 1994, at 6:00pm EST, The Ham Radio & More  
>>>>show will feature the "Rational Code Debate". (yea sure) Guesting will be  
>>>>Internet's own Dana Meyers against the code being required, and Paul  
>>>>Flaherty for it.

>>>

>>>"Shake hands gentlemen. I want this to be a clean fight!" :-))

>>

>>Hey, this might not be a \_fair\_ fight! One might expect a pro-coder to  
>>have a better fist. How's your fist, Dana?

>For sending code or for punching people? Given I don't often punch  
>people, I really don't know how my fist is in that use.

There is so much debate on this subject on this newsgroup that this show  
should be super; however, EVERYBODY seems to have an opinion or  
at least, a certain direction they go in to form their conclusions. So, I'm  
asking ALL of you to e'mail me questions you would like addressed to the  
participants on the show. Each will be asked the same questions to debate,  
and ALL your input is appreciated.

I would also look to find somebody wanting to make a transcript of the  
entire show, which can be put onto this newsgroup and on the Ham Radio  
& More [www](http://www.hamradio.com) page.

73, Len, KB7LPW

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #485

\*\*\*\*\*